

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

35 USC § 112

The Office previously rejected **claim 21** under 35 USC § 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement, and specifically pointed to the use of the phrase "...plurality of modified mononucleosides..." The applicant respectfully disagrees.

It is unclear to the applicant how such phrase may not be properly supported as the term "plurality" is expressly present in the applicant's definition of nucleoside library (see *e.g.* page 5, lines 10 et seq. "The term "nucleoside library" as used herein refers to a plurality of chemically distinct nucleosides") as acknowledged by the Examiner. Furthermore, despite the Examiner's statement to the contrary, the term "modified" is literally supported by the specification (see *e.g.*, page 4, line 20 et seq. "...thereby forming a first modified nucleoside and a second modified nucleoside, and thereby creating a nucleoside library with at least two library members..."). Finally, the term "mononucleoside" is clearly supported throughout the specification by its definition as well as by the consistent use in examples and other portions of the present application. Nevertheless, the applicant amended claim 21 to even more clearly point out what is being claimed.

The Examiner further pointed out that claim 21 would lack a description of "...the kind of modification in the mononucleosides...". Once more, it is unclear to the applicant how the Office could come to such conclusion as previously amended claim 21 specifically recited that a reaction of a reagent with the reactive group of a nucleoside would form the modified nucleoside. Nevertheless, the applicant amended claim 21 to even more clearly point out what is being claimed.

The Office also previously rejected **claims 21-26** under 35 USC § 112 as being indefinite for various reasons. The applicant disagrees, nevertheless has amended claim 21. Amended claim 21 should overcome the Examiner's concerns.

35 USC § 103

The Office previously maintained the rejection of **claims 21-26, 7, 8, 10-18, and 22** under 35 USC § 102 as being obvious over Carver (WO 99/64378) in view of Gravert (Chem. Reviews). The applicant disagrees, especially in view of the amendments made herein.

As amended herein, claim 21 recites a "...**method of generating a mononucleoside library** comprising a first mononucleoside and a second mononucleoside..." having one step of "...reacting the reactive group of the first and second mononucleosides with a **first nucleophilic reagent and second nucleophilic reagent**, respectively, thereby forming a first modified mononucleoside and a second modified mononucleoside, and **thereby creating the mononucleoside library**...". None of these elements are taught or suggested by Carver or Gravert. On the contrary, Carver teaches nucleoside peptides, which is entirely inconsistent with mononucleoside libraries as presently claimed. Furthermore, Carver employs an electrophilic reagent to react a nucleoside with a linker reagent, which teaches against the subject matter as presently claimed.

With respect to Gravert, the applicant points out that the author teaches synthesis of an oligonucleotide on a soluble polymer, which clearly teaches against the subject matter as expressly claimed in all of the amended claims. For at least these reasons, amended claims 21-26 are not obvious over Carver in view of Gravert.

Appl. No. 09/904,248
Reply to Office action of July 1, 2003

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

Claims 21-26 are pending in this application. The applicant requests allowance of all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,


RUTAN & TUCKER

Date:

9/30/03

Attorneys for Applicant
P.O. Box 1950
Costa Mesa, CA 92628-1950

By



Martin Fessenmaier, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 46,697
Tel.: (714) 641-5100
Customer No. 34284